

Summit Finale: Praise From Weinberger

In Washington, Some Arms Control Experts Lament Absence of Progress

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 21 — Some arms control experts criticized President Reagan today for apparently failing to reach any concrete agreements to affirm existing arms accords with Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, during their two-day meeting.

But Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, who had expressed concern that Mr. Reagan might be pressured into statements of support for the 1979 antiballistic missile treaty and the 1979 strategic arms limitation accord, praised Mr. Reagan for standing firm. He said it was "significant and vital" that the two leaders agreed to curb work on space-based defenses.

One of the arms control experts, Spurgeon Keeny, who president of the Arms Control Association and former deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said:

"There is no evidence that there was

any progress on the central issue of strategic arms control because the statement remains adamant on his commitment to strategic defense, which is a fundamental obstacle to reaching any concrete agreements to affirm existing arms accords with Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, during their two-day meeting.

Bipartisan Support Shown

On Capitol Hill, in a show of bipartisan support that began before the summit meeting, when Democrats endorsed Mr. Reagan's mission, Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill of the House of Representatives, who is a Massachusetts Democrat, planned to join Senator Bob Dole, Republican of Kansas, who is the Senate majority leader, in greeting Mr. Reagan on his arrival at Andrews Air Force Base.

The House Democratic leadership, in a statement issued by Mr. O'Neill, denounced the ambivalence of members of Congress.

"We believe the discussions in Geneva have begun the important pro-

cess of reducing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union," the statement said. But it added, "We had hoped for more substantive progress in arms control, human rights and regional conflicts."

Senator Dole said the summit meeting was "a hopeful beginning to a process of dialogue and negotiations," which he said he hoped "will become more comprehensive and bring more concrete progress in the future."

Kennedy Is Unenthusiastic

Some members of Congress reacted with skepticism to the summit. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, said, "Perhaps the summit could have gone better, but it could also have gone much worse."

Representative Michael D. Barnes, Democrat of Maryland, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said, "There isn't tremendous euphoria here."

Conservative members who have

been critical of the Administration's efforts to improve relations with the Soviet Union expressed disquiet. Senator Malcolm Wallop, Republican of Wyoming, said, "I have big reservations about annual summits." He said this would lead to efforts in the United States to improve "the climate" for such meetings and a lessening of criticism of the Soviet Union.

Gerard Smith Is Critical

President Reagan's reported refusal to abandon research on a space-based missile defense system, popularly known as "Star Wars," drew praise from Mr. Weinberger. It is unusual for Cabinet members to issue statements of praise for a President, since such support is assumed. But Mr. Weinberger did not attend the summit conference and he had sent a letter to Mr. Reagan urging him to stand firm.

Gerard C. Smith, a former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said the results of the summit

meeting were "very thin" on arms control.

"Cap Weinberger should be very pleased," Mr. Smith said. "His advice has been followed exactly."

Senator Sam Nunn, Democrat of Georgia, regarded as a specialist on arms control, was optimistic. He noted that the joint statement mentioned the possibility of negotiating the medium-range missile issue separately from the strategic weapons and space issues.

He also praised the discussion in Geneva of a possible "nuclear risk reduction center," which had been proposed by him and Senator John Warner, Republican of Virginia.

Little was said publicly in Geneva about human rights discussions between Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev. The National Conference on Soviet Jewry, a group interested in facilitating the emigration of Soviet Jews, said in a statement:

"While the fate of Soviet Jewry is not

formally linked to security issues, it is a concern of the American people which the Soviet Union must satisfy before there can be trust in their word on bilateral or multilateral issues."

Shulman Laments Deadlock

Marshall D. Shulman, director of Columbia University's Harriman Institute for Advanced Studies of the Soviet Union, said that while the tone of the summit meeting was encouraging, he was concerned about the lack of progress on arms control.

"One can only be pleased that the tone of the conversations was good and it may be that this will have intangible benefits for the future," he said. "But we have to be concerned that both countries are approaching deployment of new ballistic missiles, new cruise missiles, new submarines, and new bombers, and as these come along, they will inevitably be part of a tension-begging process."

President, Back in the U.S., Sees Hope of 'New Realism'

Continued From Page 1

terms," Mr. Reagan asserted, mankind could "at last long escape the prison of mutual terror."

His prepared 20-minute speech not only offered a review of the Reagan-Gorbachev sessions — the two leaders met alone for nearly five hours in Geneva — but also provided a glimpse of American policy toward the Russians in the aftermath of the first summit meeting since 1979.

Mr. Reagan added that "we discussed threats to the peace in several

regions of the world."

I explained my proposals for a peace process to stop the wars in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola and Cambodia, where insurgents fight that speak for the people are pitted against regimes which obviously do not represent the will or the approval of the people."

'They Hit It Off Amazingly'

Beyond this, the Geneva summit meeting was framed by Mr. Reagan's apparent personal rapport with Mr. Gorbachev — "they hit it off amazingly," one White House aide said — the last-minute decision to issue a joint communiqué after considerable wrangling over language with the Russians and a series of agreements that included cultural and technical exchanges, plans to open consulates in Kiev and New York and a North Pacific air safety pact to avoid incidents such as the shooting down of the Korean airliner that had entered into Soviet airspace.

Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev concluded what the President called their "fireside summit" in Geneva without a formal agreement, or even guidelines, on how to limit nuclear arsenals. "Serious differences remain on a number of critical issues," said the communiqué.

But standing on a podium in Geneva at a brief closing ceremony, at the International Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev chatted amiably before separate departures — Mr. Reagan to Brussels, Mr. Gorbachev to Prague — to brief their allies.

Before their departures, the two men toasted one another with champagne in a celebratory ceremony.

Although Robert C. McFarlane, the White House national security adviser, said the summit was "a great success," a statement was issued today in Geneva that outlines a number of initiatives endorsed by the two leaders.

"While acknowledging the differences in their systems and approaches to the world, the two leaders achieved a greater understanding of each side's views was achieved by the two leaders," said the communiqué.

"They agreed about the need to im-

German Arrested on Charge Of Biking Ex-Chess Champion

HAMBURG, West Germany, Nov. 21 (Reuters) — A West German broadcasting executive has been arrested on suspicion of swindling Anatoly Karpov, the former world chess champion from the Soviet Union, out of \$100,000 in royalties, the public prosecutor's office announced today.

Mr. Karpov has accused the executive, Helmut Jungwirth, of embezzling the fees from an advertising deal with a Hong Kong-based manufacturer of computerized chess games. Mr. Jungwirth, a former friend of Mr. Karpov's and deputy head of West German radio studio in Hanover, acted as intermediary in the deal.

Mr. Jungwirth, who denies the charges, was taken into custody "because investigations have gone far enough to make such a decision appear justified," a spokesman for the Hamburg prosecutor's office said. He did not elaborate.

Mr. Karpov, who lost his title to Gary Kasparov this month, said he had a match in Moscow, had arranged to have royalties from the advertising deal paid to him through Mr. Jungwirth's bank account. The deal was signed in 1978.

Mr. Jungwirth said he had passed on the money, but Mr. Karpov said he never received it.



JOINT STATEMENT: President Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev chatting as Secretary of State George P. Shultz, right, and Eduard A. Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister, signed documents at the conclusion of summit meeting yesterday in Geneva.

prove U.S.-Soviet relations and the international situation as a whole," it added.

'A Certain Momentum'

Mr. Reagan said in Geneva, "These two days of talks should inject a certain momentum into our work on the issues between us, a momentum we can continue at the meeting we've decided on next year."

The United States official said the session was tentatively scheduled for June in Washington, with a follow-up meeting in Moscow the following year. Shortly after the joint Reagan-Gorbachev appearance, the Soviet leader

held a news conference at the Soviet Mission in which he reiterated his main point of contention with Mr. Reagan — over the "Star Wars" system.

If the United States proceeds with its space-based shield, Mr. Gorbachev said, "all restraint will be thrown to the winds." Privately, officials said that Mr. Gorbachev's discussion of "Star Wars" with Mr. Reagan was marked by anger.

Appearing in the Capitol tonight, Mr. Reagan pointed out that the United States and the Soviet Union "remain far apart on many issues," such as the ongoing war in Afghanistan, human rights, arms limitation and the

Administration's proposed space-based shield against enemy missiles. But the President, obviously fired after a 20-hour day that included a two-hour stopover in Brussels to brief allied peoples and that to this and he wanted to hasten arms control negotiations.

"The world is waiting the results," said Mr. Reagan.

An Administration official said that Mr. Reagan was essentially urging the leaders to begin the American public tonight — as he had in Geneva — to, as

the official said, "get on with it, get movement and positions," start dealing solely with negotiations to limit offensive weapons, which has been hampered by the Soviet insistence that Mr. Reagan abandon his "Star Wars" program.

On the human rights issue which the Administration has publicly muted in recent weeks, Mr. Reagan said, "Human rights is not an abstract moral issue — not a peace issue."

"Those countries which respect the rights of their own people tend inevitably to respect the rights of their neighbors," Mr. Reagan said in his prepared text.

Text of the Joint U.S.-Soviet Statement: 'Greater Understanding Achieved'

Special to The New York Times

GENEVA, Nov. 21 — Following is the text of the joint U.S.-Soviet statement at the end of the summit meeting today, as made public by the White House:

By mutual agreement, the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, met in Geneva Nov. 19-21. Attending the meeting on the U.S. side were Secretary of State George P. Shultz, chief of staff, Donald T. Regan, Assistant to the President, Robert C. McFarlane, Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Arthur A. Hartman, special adviser to the President and the Secretary of State for Arms Control, Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Ryzanov L. Ridgway, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Jack F. Matlock.

Attending on the Soviet side were member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard A. Shevardnadze, First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgi M. Korniyenko, Ambassador to the United States, Anatoly F. Dobrynin; head of the Department of Propaganda of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Aleksandr N. Yakovlev; head of the Department of International Information of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Leonid M. Zamyatin; assistant to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Andrei M. Aleksandrov.

These comprehensive discussions covered the basic questions of U.S.-Soviet relations and the current international situation. The meetings were frank and useful. Serious differences remain on a number of critical issues. While acknowledging the differences in their systems and approaches to international relations, the two leaders achieved a greater understanding of each side's view was achieved by the two leaders. They agreed about the need to improve U.S.-Soviet relations and the international situation as a whole.

Security

The sides, having discussed key security issues, and conscious of the special responsibility of the USSR and the U.S. for maintaining peace, have agreed that nuclear war must not be won and must never be fought. Recognizing that any conflict between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. could have catastrophic consequences, they emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not seek to achieve military superiority.

Nuclear and Space Talks

The President and the General Secretary discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

They agreed to accelerate the work at these negotiations, with a view to accomplishing the tasks set down in the Joint U.S.-Soviet Agreement of Jan. 8, 1985, to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability.

Noting the proposals recently tabled by the U.S. and the Soviet Union, they agreed to continue the process, in particular in areas where there is common ground, including the principles of reducing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, the statement said. But it added, "We had hoped for more substantive progress in arms control, human rights and regional conflicts."

ple of 50 percent reductions in the nuclear arms of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., appropriately applied, as well as the idea of an interim I.N.F. agreement.

During the negotiation of these agreements, effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations assumed will be agreed upon.

Risk Reduction Centers

The sides agreed to study the question at the expert level of centers to reduce nuclear risk taking into account the issues and developments in the Geneva negotiations. They took satisfaction in such recent steps in reducing the risk of nuclear war as the signing of the Nonproliferation of the Soviet-U.S. hot line.

Nuclear Nonproliferation

General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan reaffirmed the commitment of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the interest in strengthening together with other countries the nonproliferation regime, and further enhancing the effectiveness of the treaty, inter alia by enlarging its membership.

The U.S.S.R. and the U.S. reaffirm their commitment, assumed by them under the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to pursue negotiations in good faith on matters of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament in accordance with Article VI of the treaty.

The two sides plan to continue to promote the strengthening of the International Atomic Energy Agency and to support the activities of the agency in implementing safeguards as well as in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

They view positively the practice of regular Soviet-U.S. consultations on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, which have been businesslike and constructive, and express their intent to continue this practice in the future.

Chemical Weapons

In the context of discussing security problems, the two sides reaf-

firmed that they are in favor of a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. They agreed to accelerate efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on this matter.

The two sides agreed to intensify bilateral discussions on the level of experts on all aspects of such a chemical and scientific-technical exchange of views on regional issues on the expert level have proven useful, they agreed to continue such exchanges on a regular basis.

The sides intend to expand the programs of bilateral cultural, educational and scientific-technical exchanges, and also to develop trade and economic ties. The President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. attended the signing of the Agreement on Contacts and Exchanges in the Scientific, Educational and Cultural Fields.

They agreed on the importance of resolving humanitarian cases in the spirit of cooperation.

They believe that there should be greater understanding among our peoples and that to this end they will encourage greater travel and people-to-people contact.

Northern Pacific Air Safety

The two leaders also noted with satisfaction that, in cooperation with the Government of Japan, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to a set of measures to promote safety on air routes in the North Pacific and have worked out steps to implement them.

Civil Aviation Consulates

They acknowledged that delegations from the United States and the Soviet Union have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates general in New York and Kiev.

Environmental Protection

Both sides agreed to contribute to the preservation of the environment

ministries and departments in such fields as agriculture, housing and protection of the environment have been useful.

Recognizing that exchanges of views on regional issues on the expert level have proven useful, they agreed to continue such exchanges on a regular basis.

The sides intend to expand the programs of bilateral cultural, educational and scientific-technical exchanges, and also to develop trade and economic ties. The President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. attended the signing of the Agreement on Contacts and Exchanges in the Scientific, Educational and Cultural Fields.

They agreed on the importance of resolving humanitarian cases in the spirit of cooperation.

They believe that there should be greater understanding among our peoples and that to this end they will encourage greater travel and people-to-people contact.

They acknowledged that delegations from the United States and the Soviet Union have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates general in New York and Kiev.

Northern Pacific Air Safety

The two leaders also noted with satisfaction that, in cooperation with the Government of Japan, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to a set of measures to promote safety on air routes in the North Pacific and have worked out steps to implement them.

Civil Aviation Consulates

They acknowledged that delegations from the United States and the Soviet Union have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates general in New York and Kiev.

Environmental Protection

Both sides agreed to contribute to the preservation of the environment

— a global task — through joint research and practical measures in accordance with the existing U.S.-Soviet agreement in this area, consultations will be held next year in Moscow and Washington on specific programs of cooperation.

Exchange Initiatives

The two leaders agreed on the utility of broadening exchanges and contacts including some of their new forms in a number of scientific, educational, medical and sports fields (inter alia, cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction; measures to promote Russian language studies in the United States and English language studies in the U.S.S.R.); the annual exchange of professors to conduct special courses in history, culture and economics at the relevant departments of Soviet and American institutions of higher education; mutual allocation of scholarships for the best students in the natural sciences, technology, social sciences and humanities for the period of an academic year; holding regular meetings in various sports and increased television coverage of sports events). The two sides agreed to resume cooperation in combating cancer diseases.

The relevant agencies in each of the countries are being instructed to develop specific programs for these exchanges. The resulting programs will be approved by the leaders at their next meeting.

Fusion Research

The two leaders emphasized the potential importance of the work aimed at utilizing controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes and, in this connection, advocated the widest practicable development of international cooperation in obtaining the sources of energy, which is essentially inexhaustible, for the benefit for all mankind.

Summit Finale: Russian Is Optimistic

Excerpts From Gorbachev News Session: 'All Have a Stake'

GENEVA, Nov. 21 (AP) — Following are excerpts from Mikhail S. Gorbachev's news conference in Geneva today, as translated by the Swiss organizers of the summit meeting.

OPENING STATEMENT

We, too, have fairly well assessed the realities of the situation. You can see just how far the militarization of the economy has progressed and even political thinking along those lines. But we do, we have full well appreciated that the situation in the world is too dangerous to give up even the slightest chance of correcting, of redressing the situation of moving toward more stable and lasting peace.

I've already found ourselves on the threshold — in fact, within a few months before the actual summit meeting — that we began paving the way in a sense to the very Geneva summit meeting, and we began trying to establish a favorable climate for that meeting.

Back in the summer already, we unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions and expressed our readiness to immediately begin talks on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. We similarly established a unilateral moratorium on antisatellite weapons and, as you know, we submitted radical proposals for the reduction of nuclear arsenals.

Our proposals not to have the arms race extended into space were accompanied by proposals for establishing the broadest possible international cooperation for peaceful research and utilization of outer space for the benefit of all nations.

Basis for Mutual Understanding
And did we utmost to lay the basis for a mutual understanding before the meeting would get under way, to improve the political atmosphere.

So, as I say, already at the threshold of the Geneva summit meeting, there were political consultative meetings held together among the Warsaw Pact member countries in Sofia, where there were loud voices raised by the socialist countries in favor of peace, détente, cooperation, voices raised against the arms race, voices raised against confrontation and in favor of an improved international situation in the interests of all people of this earth. And all of these measures were dictated by a sense of responsibility for the fate of the world. They did not meet with the reaction might have hoped for from partners in the Geneva talks before that meeting would be held.

We firmly maintained a constructive position, and we felt it was necessary to go through every effort to establish an example. The very complexity of the international situation convinced us that direct talks with the President of the U.S.A. would be the right of the tremendous part the Soviet Union and the United States play, of course, which give rise to domestic responsibility, as well as for those states and the political leaders.

The Nuclear Threat
Our reason was that the time had come where in light of the nuclear threat that hung over us all, we would have to get down to business together. And we're all, to the same extent, involved, our Soviet people — and here I'm utterly convinced the American people as well — have a stake in this.

All peoples of the world have a stake in these talks. We continue to feel that people throughout the world want peace, and that they aspire to a situation whereby peace not only be maintained, but that the situation be improved, that true progress be achieved to halt the arms race, to all dimensions.

There are two main aspects in this process. One is we are doing on the one hand is consistent toward the aspirations of nations throughout the world, regardless of where they live, regardless of their political creeds and religious beliefs, whatever their traditions might be. And at the same time, there's also the responsibility side.

Time of Responsibility
I might sum up in a word. To characterize the present international situation, the state of which we find ourselves now, I would characterize that as a time of great responsibility. And people throughout the world have understood that, and are acting accordingly. But from that, of course, from that situation, that assessment of the situation, we must have policies, state policies modeled as a function of these policies, policies which will be preserved by their political leaders.

I was much impressed by the letters I received from the Soviet Union, and the United States of America, from all of Europe, Asia, Africa, even Australia. From children, women, men, war veterans. And it's very important that I stress just how just how prominent in this respect were youth, because it is their future.

It is for youths, this future. It is they who will be taking over the responsibility for the fate of this world.

Sessions With Reagan
And about the meeting itself now, a few words. There were quite a number of private sessions held with President Reagan before the actual talks themselves. I would say, just a matter of arithmetic, how many hours it took. These were very frank talks. Sometimes they were very lively. At one point it actually became very, very lively indeed. And nevertheless, I think they were to a certain extent productive talks.

Of course, a great deal more time was spent in these private sessions than planned. In fact, I would say they took up the main part of the time allotted to us over the two days. And now that they are saying goodbye, I was trying to think back just how many times we did meet. I think it was some five or six different occasions we had to meet and had no opportunity to spend a little good hour talking to one another.

And this enabled us to discuss a wide range of issues, looking at one another straight in the eye. The talks proceeded in political language in a very open way, in a very straightforward manner. And I think that was not only of great significance, I'd say it was decisive.

And it was especially during those talks as well as during the plenary sessions, and through the more extensive contacts we had among the various members of the Soviet delegation, including the experts, the Soviet and American, these experts being the greatest authorities on the subjects discussed, not only in our two countries but the world as a whole, the fact that all this occurred made it possible during the course of two days to accomplish a very serious piece of work.

We submitted our own thoughts to the President, our assessment of the international situation and our basic premise in regard to that. And that's what I think is the world there have been radical changes, radical changes that require new approaches and fresh thinking about a number of issues that affect the interests of all of us.

In other words, the very objectively assessed course of world events has meant that questions we had and posed questions of surprise — and here let me stress that I'm specifically using the word survival not in an effort to dramatize the situation or to intimidate anyone, but to demonstrate that we all keenly feel that this is the reality of the world today — these matters were given priority, inasmuch as this is the key, the burning issue that affects the interests of all of us.

And I would say that the failure to look for solutions to these overwhelming problems is something we cannot do.

The Will of the People

We are speaking about the will of the Soviet people, and the will of the American people, and the will of all peoples of the world. And beyond that, we have again drawn the attention of the American side to yet another circumstance about which I have already had occasion to speak.

But it's such an important circumstance, one to which we attach such very great importance that we feel it is necessary to reiterate it again at this session.

And that is the fact that it's already difficult for us to engage in a constructive dialogue, to halt the arms race and the nuclear arms race, but tomorrow it will be even more difficult to carry off, which is why that is why we needed responsible dialogue, because we all have now reached that borderline where we have to give great thought to the realistic possibility of a new approach to national interests that would indicate just how we should proceed in future in the world.

What governs the actual thinking of the American Administration? That required a great deal of work on our part to appreciate that. Great effort was invested in that regard, and I might add I would go so far as to say that we had to endeavor to be unbiased.

Shared Initial Premise

During the course of that meeting, we understood that we were to share a certain initial premise concerning improving our relations. That is the understanding that a nuclear war cannot occur, that there can be no winners in a nuclear war.

The differences between our two countries remain. There is still competition between us, but we have to try and keep it all on this so that it does not come into the sphere of military rivalry.

We're quite well aware of the weaker and stronger points of the American society, as well as of the Soviet society, and we are aware of the achievements they can claim, their potential, and naturally we're all the more aware of our own potential, some of which is still untapped.

In a word, we are for competition with the United States, for active rivalry with the United States.

The problem of war and peace lies at the center of the policies of all countries, of the greatest concern to all countries, developed capitalist countries, the socialist countries, the developing countries. There are the economic problems that face them, social problems, ecological problems, these all can be successfully solved if we work together, if we understand each other.

We must have dialogue for this. We must broaden our trade and cooperation. We must find out what we can do for each other. And finally the problem of our developing world. We mustn't shut our eyes to the fact that the developing world is a reality, and we must find new policies which will reflect the realities of what's happening in this enormous continent, hundreds of different countries that are trying to achieve a better life, a better standard.

And the most important issue, I'll come back to it, we must do everything we can to stop the arms race. Everybody understands that. I'm convinced that the old approaches, the old ways which take into account nothing more than these purely personal interests, a purely isolated approach, will take us no further.

We must have a new policy which answers the needs of today's states and the realities of today, and all the things which world history has put to the forefront.

Common Cause of Nations

And there is one other thing involved in what we were talking about in Geneva at the summit meeting. It revolved around certain subjects, that is the common cause of all nations. I think that the overwhelming majority of political leaders are in favor of accelerating the Geneva process so as to come up with means of halting the arms race and engaging in disarmament.

The actual truth is, the Soviet Union is open to controls. And if there is agreement achieved to ban the extension of weapons into outer space, then again we're prepared to open our laboratories to all sorts of verifications or checks.

But we're being told to open our laboratories already so that they can check out whether we're engaged in research for outer-space weapons. But that's not even logical. That's certainly unacceptable at this stage.

If the U.S. authority calls a halt to any nuclear testing, and if we can arrive at agreement on that, there will be absolutely no problems on our side with regard to verification.

At this stage, the divergence between our two positions emerged. But we're certainly prepared to sort of work out some mutually acceptable solution, provided there is no arms race in space.

Arms Race and Soviet

I've tried to be very sincere with the President in our talks. It seems to me that much of the American policy with regard to the Soviet Union is based on misunderstanding. In some cases, people feel that the arms race exhausts the Soviet Union economically, and



TALKING TO REPORTERS: Mikhail S. Gorbachev at news conference.

thereby strengthens the hand of the United States of America.

But history has already disproven such prophecies in the past. We've always been able to respond. So I think there's some sort of an illusion prevailing in military spheres and that it has somehow managed to come across to certain political circles. Maybe this has even reached the President himself.

I must say we did get the impression that the Americans are certainly very strong in certain areas of technology, particularly in computer sciences, in radio communication, and of course there's the desire too for us to grab onto that and gain some sort of superiority.

But one could even quote President Johnson, way back, who said that whoever manages to gain power in space will rule the earth. And they're just itching to get their hands into it. They're just itching to get this world domination and look down on the world from on high. It's an old, longstanding ambition.

The Right to Choose

The internal pressures of every particular country, the interests of every people, the peoples who own these sovereign rights in their countries, the right to choose, to choose which path they're going to take, to choose which system they're going to use, the methods and forms which their countries processes are going to take, even their choice of friends, that's the right of each nation.

If we don't recognize this, then I don't know how we can build international relations. When I traveled to England in December last year, it was last year, wasn't it? I decided that I was going to come back to the words of the great Palmerston. Palmerston was a great statesman, he had a lot of friends or eternal enemies, it only has eternal interests.

Perhaps I haven't translated Palmerston correctly into Russian, but I think that's the spirit of what he said, so that's what I said to Thatcher. I said I agree with that. But if you and Palmerston, you're now his successor, if you recognize that you have your interests, then of course you have to recognize that other nations also have their interests.

Question of Cooperation

And when about 200 different countries in the international forum have their say, then of course everyone has to express his own interests. But the question is to what degree their interests will be realized. That depends on them and the rest of us. It's a common concern, it's a question of cooperation.

But if and when that whole world is somebody's backyard, I — here, I'm talking both in terms of the Soviet Union and of the United States and of other countries — we do not accept this principle. We have always said 10 years ago, and today we repeat it and we'll say it tomorrow, we have no ambiguous policy in this respect. Our policies are open and honest. And let's the way we act.

The tension — this is what we said both to the President and the American delegation, conflicts and even whole regions and wars, the wars which take place in this or that region between this or that country, whichever part of the world it's in — these are all based upon what happened in the past, and upon the social and economic conditions in which these countries and regions are existing today.

'The Hand of Moscow'

To imagine that all these contradictions are just a result of the rivalry between East and West would be not only wrong but it would be very dangerous. If in today's world, Mexico and several other countries, rich countries, and there I could include Brazil, find themselves incapable not only of paying their debts but of paying the interest on their debts.

You can imagine what effect that's having on their societies. And this situation is going to get worse. There is going to be an explosion, so again, are people going to say, That's the hand of Moscow? You can't. Can you be so irresponsible to give those kinds of opinions on these sorts of issues?

On the world stage, some people still do blame Moscow for everything, but they shouldn't. It should not be allowed, especially at meetings like this, to agree to first that we're not going to say stupid things to each other of this sort.

Enough of that sort of stupid remark has been said here. Thanks to you, my journalistic friends.

Source of Responsibility

Of course the Soviet Union and the United States, the two most powerful states in their global interests, with their own allies and friends, they all have their own priorities in the world. But I think that the Soviet leadership sees this not as a source of confrontation but rather as a source of particular responsibility that our countries hold.

The Soviet Union and the United States of America and their leaders are responsible for the future of the world, that's how we see it. Of course we can discuss and argue about

this or that part of the world, the way things are there, of course there are differences, actions anywhere will be different, very often they'll be completely contradictory.

In principle, we have nothing against discussing regional problems here or there, and trying to find ways in which we can help to put things right.

But at the same time, we continue to stress, and I want to say now, we want to do it without any interference in the internal affairs of any country.

Such is our conception of Soviet-American relations. And that's the sort of attitude with which we came to this meeting, with which we talked to the President and the whole of his delegation.

U.S. Soviet Relations

We considered that to improve Soviet-American relations — it is perfectly possible a lot of problems have built up. I would say there are loads of problems which really have to be, the path has to be cleared before we can go ahead. But the Soviet leadership has the political will to do this work of clearing the path. But we must work together.

When you find the path is blocked if you're a geologist or a miner, then a special brigade is called up to decide how can we save the mine, how can we save the people who are stuck behind this landslide, as it were.

And we too, we must decide how to save our relationship from the stress which has built up, how we must go from confusion and into a more healthy way of solving problems. This work we must do through our united efforts.

We are prepared for this sort of united effort. I said to the president that it would be a great shame and a mistake if we don't make use, you and me, of the opportunity which has appeared for us to change the direction of the situation that we find ourselves in.

I would like to come back to the main issue, which really was the central thread of our meeting. Not a single meeting, not a single round of talks at the tête-à-tête went by without us talking about war and peace, about disarmament and so on. This was the main thread of the Geneva meeting.

The 'Star Wars' Program

We expected the American side, that the 'Star Wars' program will not only lead to a further arms race, but it will mean that all restraint will be blown to the winds.

We said again and again, the American side was saying that it's a defensive system, a rocket system with some space weapons. They kept saying, How can you say after the Geneva meeting to your people that you refused the possibility of cutting down on offensive weapons?

Our answer to that is one I will repeat for you now: we are prepared to engage in radical cutbacks in nuclear weapons provided that the door to unleashing an arms race in outer space be firmly slammed shut.

We are prepared to engage in an initial phase of 50 percent cutbacks in arsenals, and we are prepared to appeal to other nuclear powers to do the same with us as far as it further.

In certain parts of the world, among certain peoples, certain journalistic circles, there has been a certain positive reaction to S.D.I. Different people are talking about defense, it seems — defensive weapons, about a

U.S. and Soviet as Allies

Q. In World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union were allied against the common enemy of fascists and their best Fascism. On the basis of your talks in the last few days with President Reagan, do you feel that the Soviet Union and the United States are again allies, and I'd like to be specific in the following areas: in the struggle against hunger in Africa; in the struggle against international terrorism; in the struggle against environmental pollution, problems such as acid rain, and the struggle against heart disease and cancer?

A. Thank you very much for recalling a very decisive phase in our own common history. We do remember that. We haven't forgotten about that. And as a result of the Geneva meeting, I believe there is the possibility for very broad-based cooperation between our two countries and our peoples, and in saying that I'm not endeavoring to simplify things. I'm very well aware of the very deep differences that divide us, and I appreciate the realities of present Soviet-American relations. But we are nevertheless convinced that this is possible, including with cooperation in such matters as you mentioned.

I do not want to get into the ins and outs of these matters now, but I do believe that we could release tremendous resources by stopping the arms race to provide better assistance to developing countries. In America today, there are tremendous numbers of people who are suffering from famine, where 50 percent of the kids are not getting enough to eat. If we were cut back on our arms to 10 percent, we should be in a position to do a tremendous amount to alleviate such problems. I do appreciate your question, and I should like to respond affirmatively. I don't mean to say that there are not differences on how one may approach this problem.

Safety of the World

Q. President Reagan's response to your remarks on the 'Star Wars' S.D.I. program has been that we have just as many nuclear weapons after the summit, after this meeting as before the summit.

shield. But that's not the way it is at all. In actual fact, taking account of the fact that already now in the world there are such massive weapons that have been accumulated, it seems we're being told to engage in a further arms race.

Rivalry in Outer Space

We can hardly manage as it is to harness the arms race. And here in this very complex situation as it is already now, you're trying to engage in further rivalry that would take us into outer space.

But who can guarantee, who can provide any guarantees that we'll be able to engage in these sort of productive talks. I think any, anyone with common sense would agree that that's going to be difficult after S.D.I.

Try to imagine — and this is exactly what we tried to put across to the American side — just try to imagine what sort of a confrontation could arise, what's already happening now, what would happen from those missiles — at the warheads, say, if the nuclear charge were to suddenly break off from some sort of space ensemble.

I'm not even saying whose side would be responsible with such a mishap. But just imagine that could happen. There's an attempt being made, say, to destroy it. And all sorts of computers will be at work, political leaders at that point would have no way of exercising any control over it, to control the situation.

That's the sort of picture one could paint. And I tried to say to the President that since we felt that he himself was so caught up with that idea, as a human being, as an individual we could sort of understand it. But we could not understand that he as a political leader would adopt that position.

We're thinking, that after these talks the American side will very carefully sift through everything we have been able to say on this subject. We see that the Americans aren't particularly happy with our way of thinking, but frankly we failed to see their reasoning.

Sharing Technology

They say that if we're the first one to come up with this solution we'll share it with you. We've already said that we wouldn't wage a first strike against the United States of America. So why are you trying to spread the arms race into outer space? Don't you believe us when we say we won't wage a first strike?

Why should we believe you more than you should believe us? We have more ground not to believe you.

We are already preparing not to go out into outer space, not to engage in underground nuclear explosions. Generally speaking, we would like to help, actually help this way be the last word from the American Administration.

We have had some very comprehensive talks, certainly very carefully sifted through another's arguments. And we've certainly taken all that down.

If the United States has the will and determination to take account of all the destructive and negative aspects of S.D.I., I think then there really will be prospects for finding a constructive solution to problems of our international situation, particularly in the area of the arms race.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

meeting. Can you tell us if the world is a safer place because of this meeting, and if so, why?

A. I will be so bold, I think, as to state that in spite of the fact as you say there is as much weaponry as there was before, I think the world would still be so bold as to say that the world has become a more secure place.

In any case, as I see it the actual fact of this meeting and what has been achieved is a certain contribution to the question of safety and security, because we have taken the first step on the way to understanding, respect for each other, to dialogue, to all the things which improve security and strengthen it. And therefore I consider that the political effect of this meeting in Geneva for us will be positive.

Arms Cutbacks

Q. What practical, tangible steps could the Soviet Union and the United States take for a prompt cutback on the arms race?

A. It seems to me — in my general statement I spoke largely about that very thing, but do let me say that we have to stop, if we can avoid, having an arms race in space, what we've done here, what the Americans have done here, toward coming up with compromises, establishing parity at lower levels.

Of course I could elaborate on the subject. There is very good machinery available — the Geneva talks, for example — and I would just add that we are hoping that the American Administration has yet to say its last word on a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons.

The whole world is in favor of such a test ban. The Americans still have time to reflect on the matter. I think that would constitute a tremendous step toward peace. We must get one other step that would speed up the process of halting the arms race and we do believe that would also promote the Geneva process and the bolstering of the political dialogue between the Soviet and American leaderships. We did agree to extend that process, and we believe that participation in such political dialogue between high-ranking officials on both sides will further that aim.

TOM WICKER HAS A PRACTICED EYE

What he sees when he looks at national politics and policies can open your eyes. Watch for his column, in The Nation, every Monday and Friday on the Op-Ed page.

The New York Times